## REMARKS

The above Amendments and these Remarks are in reply to the Office Action mailed November 30, 2009.

### I. Summary of Examiner's Rejections

Prior to the Office Action mailed November 30, 2009, Claims 1-8, 15-29 and 31-33 were pending in the Application. In the Office Action, Claims 3 and 22 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter. Claims 1-2, 4-6, 15-18, 21, 23-25, 28 and 33 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kemper et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,804,682, hereinafter Kemper) in view of Holtz et al. (U.S. Patent No. 7,165,248, hereinafter Holtz). Claims 3, 8, 20, 22, 27, 29 and 32 were rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kemper and Holtz in view of Chan *et al.*, (U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/0028364, hereinafter Chan). Claims 7, 19 and 26 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kemper and Holtz in view of Timbol (U.S. Patent No. 6,237,135, hereinafter Timbol). Claim 31 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kemper and Holtz in view of Birkler et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,466,951, hereinafter Birkler).

### II. Summary of Applicant's Amendment

The present Reply amends Claims 1-8, 15, 17, 19-22, 28-29, and 31-34, and add new Claim 34, leaving for the Examiner's present consideration Claims 1-8, 15-29 and 31-34.

### III. Claim Rejections under 35 USC § 112

In the Office Action, Claims 3 and 22 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Applicant respectfully submits that the claims have been amended to comply with the statutory requirement under 35 U.S.C. 112. Accordingly, reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested.

## IV.    Claim Rejections under 35 USC 103

In the Office Action, Claims 1-2, 4-6, 15-18, 21, 23-25, 28 and 33 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kemper in view of Holtz. Claims 3, 8, 20, 22, 27, 29 and 32 were rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kemper and Holtz in view of Chan. Claims 7, 19 and 26 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kemper and Holtz in view of Timbol. Claim 31 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kemper and Holtz in view of Birkler.

**Claim 1**

Claim 1 has been amended to recite the following:

> 1.      (Currently Amended) A system for supporting application deployment, comprising:
> a plurality of applications deployed on a web server, wherein each application of the plurality of applications is associated with at least one deployment descriptor of a plurality of deployment descriptors that describes deployment and configuration information of the application on the web server; and
>> a builder component capable of
>>> creating a master tree data structure based on the present state of all deployment descriptor files, wherein the master tree data structure represents a state of resources associated with the plurality of applications at a given time, wherein the plurality of applications include a first application and the master tree data structure includes a sub-tree that corresponds to the first application;
>>> creating a separate tree data structure based on a current state of source files in the first application's project directory, wherein the separate tree data structure represents a state of resources associated with the first application, which is one of the plurality of applications deployed on the web server;
>>> comparing the sub-tree that corresponds to the first application in the master tree data structure with the separate tree data structure; and
>>> refreshing the master tree data structure based on the separate tree data structure, if the master tree data structure is different from the separate tree data structure.

Kemper provides a method of managing resources for a single software application (Abstract; Figure 4; Column 9, Lines 48-50). In Column 14, Lines 50-58 and Column 23 Lines

10

54-63, Kemper discloses matching a node in a parse tree based on text name and type information of a given symbol.

However, as stated in the pending Office Action, Kemper does not teach creating a separate tree data structure based on a current state of source files in an application's project directory. In addition, there is also no indication in Kemper that a master tree data structure can be created for multiple applications, based on the present state of all deployment descriptor files.

Holtz discloses a method for resolving conflicting changes encountered when reconciling parallel user changes to two synchronized trees of folders and files (Abstract). However, the two synchronized trees in Holtz are parallel to each other, and the two synchronized trees are both created based on the change, on the folders and files, made by parallel users.

Applicant respectfully submits that there is no indication in Holtz that the two synchronized trees include a master tree that is created for multiple applications based on multiple deployment descriptor files, and a separate tree for a particular application based on the source files in the particular application's project directory.

Additionally, Chan teaches development assistance for a program comprising code in more than one language (Abstract). Timbol teaches that a Java bean is bundled in a Java archive (JAR) file (Column 10, Lines 24-26).

Applicant respectfully submits that there is no indication in either Chan or Timbol that a master tree can be created for multiple applications based on multiple deployment descriptor files, and a separate tree can be created for a particular application based on the source files in the particular application's project directory.

In view of the above comments, Applicant respectfully submits that Claim 1, as amended, is neither anticipated by, nor obvious in view of the cited references, and reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested.

**Claims 15 and 21**

The comments provided above with regard to Claims 15 and 21 are herein incorporated by reference. Claims 15 and 21 have been amended in a manner similar to Claim 1 to more

11

clearly recite the embodiments therein. Applicant respectfully submits that Claims 15 and 21, as amended, are likewise neither anticipated by, nor obvious in view of the cited references, when considered alone or in combination. Reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested.

## Claim 31

Claim 31 has been amended to state a feature "*wherein the builder component is further capable of allowing a module to be shared by both the first application and a second application; disassociating the module from the first application in the master tree data structure, when the module is removed from the first application; and keeping the module in the master tree data structure to allow the second application to use the module.*"

As stated in the pending Office Action, Kemper and Holtz do not teach the above feature.

Additionally, Birkler discloses a soft delete that is used by the synchronization engine to delete items in the remote databases, and a hard delete used by the synchronization engine to delete items from the remote databases, and other host processing apparatuses that the remote processing apparatus is synchronized with (Column 6 Lines 19-29).

However, there is no indication in Birkler that, when a module is removed from the first application, the module can still be kept in the master tree data structure for the use of a second application.

In view of the above comments, Applicant respectfully submits that Claim 31, as amended, is neither anticipated by, nor obvious in view of the cited references, and reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested.

## Claims 2-8, 16-20, 22-29, and 32-33

Claims 2-8, 16-20 and 22-29 depend from and include all of the features of Claims 1, 15 and 21. Claims 2-8, 16-20 and 22-29 are not addressed in detail herein. Applicant respectfully submits that these claims are allowable at least as depending from an allowable independent claim, and further in view of the amendments to the independent claims, and the comments provided above. Reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested.

## V.    Additional Amendments

Claim 34 has been newly added by the present Reply.  Subject to the approval of the Examiner, Applicant respectfully requests that new Claim 34 be included in the Application and considered therewith.

## VI.    Conclusion

In light of the above, it is respectfully submitted that all of the claims now pending in the subject patent application should be allowable, and a Notice of Allowance is requested.  The Examiner is respectfully requested to telephone the undersigned if he can assist in any way in expediting the issuance of a patent.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any underpayment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 06-1325 for any matter in connection with this response, including any fee for extension of time, which may be required.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: January 29, 2010

By:   /Kuiran (Ted) Liu/
Kuiran (Ted) Liu
Reg. No. 60,039

Customer No. 80548
FLEISLER MEYER LLP
650 California Street, Fourteenth Floor
San Francisco, California 94108
Telephone:    (415) 362-3800

13